

Sonoma County
Emergency Food Response Gathering
Summary of Findings and Recommendations
August 2018

Prepared by: Phina Borgeson, Interfaith Sustainable Food Collaborative; Mimi Enright, UC Cooperative Extension Sonoma County; Suzi Grady, Petaluma Bounty; Melita Love, Farm to Pantry; Julia Van Soelen Kim, UC Cooperative Extension Sonoma County

Executive Summary

As the October fires cooled, members of the Sonoma County Food Recovery Coalition and the Sonoma County Food System Alliance saw the need to analyze how the emergency food response unfolded during the disaster. To improve efforts during future disasters and to minimize the number of community members who transition from short-term emergency food assistance to long term chronic food insecurity, they invited persons involved in the recent emergency food response to a gathering on February 8, 2018.

After careful mining of the information garnered through intensive conversations among more than 30 people from all aspects of the emergency food response, here are our **recommendations for next steps.**

- Survey participants represented at the gathering and stakeholders not represented to get more information and seek greater clarity on their needs. *While the convening did include representatives from most sectors (farmers, food distributors, chefs and cooks, volunteer organizers, communicators/networkers, and civic leaders) many others who are food security leaders and were involved with the emergency response were not present. Our data reveals the need for more details and a more thorough survey that includes the question, “What did you need during the disaster [information, resources, contacts, knowledge] that you didn’t have?”*
- Identify a county-wide coordinator for emergency food response. *Lack of coordination of food, related resources, and volunteers, as well as slow and ineffective communication at the County level, were repeatedly identified by participants as opportunities for improvement; also, the communication/coordination between in-county and out-of-county relief efforts needs to be improved.*
 - Connect food security representatives with the Care and Shelter Coordinator for the Sonoma County Emergency Operations Center, and include emergency food response in the shelter drill on Sept. 6, 2018.
- Develop an emergency food response assessment with a strategic plan that:
 - Identifies and expands capacity of existing governmental, nonprofit, and faith-based organizations to respond in times of disaster. *Scenarios for what could happen in future emergencies provide a way of testing the capacity and*

integration of disaster plans at a variety of levels.

- Builds on existing community and neighborhood food security networks and relationships. *There was a “spontaneous outpouring” of food and food-related help which is to be celebrated and integrated in disaster planning and built upon to reduce general food insecurity.*
- Leverages the strengths of our local farm and food-based businesses and helps to ensure their future sustainability. *There was great generosity, but not without an impact on the economic sustainability of small scale farms and businesses. Taking steps such as establishing systems to track emergency food donations and to compensate farms and businesses appropriately would help ensure longer term health.*
- Bridges the noted gap between larger centralized operations and smaller scale, grassroots, or new/spontaneously organized grassroots emergency food efforts. *While greater coordination is needed, participants also noted that there is benefit in seizing opportunities to help, even when it occasionally means “going rogue.” The challenge to emergency food response planners is balancing centralized efficiency with grassroots speed and effectiveness.*
- Creates an emergency communication plan/platform that is endorsed and sustained by the County Office of Emergency as well as community efforts. *Two related themes emphasized in our data were coordination and communication. Prompt communication with all County residents is needed.*
- Provides a directory or inventory of existing emergency food response resources. *Mapping and networking resources for safe storage and preparation of food such as cold storage, generators, commercial kitchens, transportation, etc. will also help identify where more are needed.*
- Prevents more people from slipping into long-term food insecurity. *The fires disaster raised new awareness in some quarters about pre-disaster food insecurity. More data is needed on what has happened since October.*
- Identifies methods to strengthen the overall resiliency of our local food system. *It is a shared responsibility to keep in mind the big picture and to promote goals which build on the best of Sonoma County’s agricultural heritage and neighborly culture.*

The organizers of the Emergency Food Response Gathering hope that this report will be useful to the Sonoma County Office of Recovery and Resiliency, the Board of Supervisors, and other Sonoma County leaders, as well as emergency food providers, local food system and food security advocates, and their networks. Comprehensive data from the gathering is located at:

<https://tinyurl.com/yboqdbka> and a list of questions for further investigation:

<https://tinyurl.com/y9ktes3c>.

Introduction

The scale of the October 2017 fires in Sonoma County was unprecedented. According to the Watershed Emergency Response Team report published in November 2017, the series of wildfires that started in Sonoma, Napa, Lake, Solano, and Mendocino counties is one of the most deadly and costly in California history. The Tubbs Fire alone burned a total of 36,807 acres in Sonoma and Napa Counties and was part of the complex of fires that destroyed 7,010 structures and damaged an additional 487 structures. The County of Sonoma estimates that during the fires 100,000 people were ordered to evacuate their homes.

Chronic food insecurity existed in Sonoma County before the 2017 fires. In 2017, Redwood Empire Food Bank (REFB) served 82,000 people monthly, including children, seniors, families and individuals in need. Post-fire REFB continues to offer emergency food distribution to all members in our community affected by the fires at mobile drive-through distribution sites (called Station 3990's) throughout Sonoma County. Distributions are free and open to anyone affected by the Sonoma Complex Fire, including: those who lost homes, employment or wages, access to previous food assistance; those who are sheltering others who lost homes; and those who experienced financial hardship following the fires due to loss of power and gas, and/or access to work. According to Allison Goodwin, REFB Director of Programs, "in the early days of the disaster, food was provided to 1,200 households weekly. Now, 500 households still seek help each week, and it's not clear how the fires will impact hunger long term" (Press Democrat, July 15, 2018).

During the fires, community-based connections unfolded quickly creating regionalized and sustained local food responses that leveraged existing and new distribution organizations, local farms, and local chefs to provide emergency food relief for evacuees and first responders. Key members of the Sonoma County Food Recovery Coalition and the Sonoma County Food System Alliance recognized the need to analyze how the emergency food response evolved during the disaster in an effort to improve the model for future disasters, to minimize the number of community members who transition from short-term emergency food assistance to long term chronic food insecurity, and to strengthen the region's food system.

Methods

The principal collaborators on this joint effort were Phina Borgeson, Interfaith Sustainable Food Collaborative; Mimi Enright, UC Cooperative Extension Sonoma County; Suzi Grady, Petaluma Bounty; Melita Love, Farm to Pantry; Julia Van Soelen Kim, UC Cooperative Extension Sonoma County; and Evan Wiig, Community Alliance with Family Farmers, with input from Tim Page, FEED Sonoma, and Kaelyn Ramsden.

The **Emergency Food Response Gathering** was held on **February 8, 2018** from 9:00AM to 12:00PM at the North Coast Builders Exchange with over 30 participants, including the event organizers (Appendix 1: Event Attendees). Attendees represented a cross section of people and organizations involved in the emergency food response around the County, ranging from the centralized efforts of Redwood Empire Food Bank and local government agencies to the grassroots efforts of local chefs, farmers, faith-based organizations, food redistribution nonprofits, and other nonprofits engaged in food security.

The gathering provided opportunity for dynamic conversations across place (location in County), space (faith-based, government, nonprofit, business sectors) and scale (grassroots, centralized) (Appendix 2: Event Agenda). The event centered on four guiding questions:

1. What went well?
2. What were new relationships that were made?
3. What were the tensions?
4. What is needed for the future?

These guiding questions were explored individually at the opening and closing of the day as well as in small breakout groups organized by:

1. Roles within the emergency food response: farmers; distributors; chefs and cooks; volunteer organizers; and communicators/networkers.
2. Scale: countywide or larger; sub-region of the county; community/neighborhood.
3. Geography: Central - Santa Rosa; East - Sonoma; West - West County; North - Windsor to Cloverdale; South - Petaluma.

The event helped document the experiences, unique perspectives, and critical input of emergency food response practitioners, provided greater clarity on specific needs for county-wide emergency response efforts going forward, and demonstrated the breadth of people committed to and passionate about food security and our local food system. Participants stated that they met other service providers and learned of additional resources in their community for the first time at the convening.

Findings

A work group reviewed, coded, and thematically analyzed the qualitative data collected at the event using an open-coding process with attention to new and emergent themes. Below is a summary of key data points: how the emergency food supply chain functioned in the disaster; the relationship and communication mechanisms used; and the potential for leveraging the capacity built towards longer-term community food security. See Appendix 3 for more information regarding the data analysis and access to the raw data.

**Emergency Food Distribution Infrastructure:
Supply Chain**

| Successes | Challenges |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Existing food distribution infrastructure (e.g., Redwood Empire Food Bank’s facility; Catholic Charities’ refrigerated trucks) ● Generally good integration of food donations, grassroots and centralized emergency food distributions, and volunteers that leveraged existing food distribution networks that could “<i>plug right into shelter needs</i>” in specific areas. ● Food resources from inside the county; a “<i>spontaneous outpouring</i>” of food for first responders from local farmers who provided a “<i>surge of local produce</i>”, and local chefs who “<i>stepped up</i>” to capitalize on their pre-existing food business relationships and use excess food to “<i>get meals out</i>” to the community. ● Food resources from outside the county, including from the Bay Area (e.g., Facebook, Google) as well as nationally (Red Cross). ● Redwood Empire Food Bank as a central hub, capable of handling a disaster of this scale and well-equipped in the county to handle the acquisition, storage, and distribution of emergency food using their 64,000 sq./ft. facility with 5,000 sq./ft. of cold storage, fleet of trucks and drivers, volunteer capacity, and the ability to receive and distribute millions of pounds of food across the county. ● FEED Sonoma as another important node, using volunteer distributors to source, store, and transport donated produce. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Lack of key supply chain infrastructure given the scale of emergency food distribution needs. Specifically lacking: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ county-level coordination of perishable food ○ accessible cold storage distribution points ○ centralized commercial kitchens equipped with power/backup generators ○ public understanding of food donation safety ● The small scale and lack of integration between and with grassroots nonprofits. ● The accurate distribution of food resources; food over abundant or scarce at different points in time, or at different locations. |

**Emergency Food Distribution Human Infrastructure:
Communication, Coordination, and Relationships**

| Successes | Challenges |
|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Leverage of pre-existing knowledge of the County and relationships across place, space, and scale. ● Key relationships. Redwood Empire Food Bank, emergency food providers (e.g., Catholic Charities), gleaners and food rescue groups (e.g., Farm to Pantry and Food Runners), farmers, chefs, restaurants (e.g., Backyard), grocery stores, and other food businesses/food donors, distributors (e.g., FEED Sonoma) providing the trucks and volunteers to source, store, transport, and distribute emergency food. <i>Chefs explained that it was “relationships, both old and new” that worked well; when asked, “what is one thing I learned today? I already knew it, but that relationships are key. Keep building them.”</i> ● Farmers leveraging community, wholesale buyer and social media relationships to get their fresh local produce to people in need. ● Self-organized emergency response at the community level; “stellar,” “efficient,” “quick,” “timely”, providing “high quality of food” (e.g., No Pay Cafe/Café Gratis in Sonoma). <i>West County “self-organized in a collaborative way”. “Going rogue”.</i> ● Grassroots community connections with faith communities and other trusted community partners helping ensure prompt localized responses. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Lack of sufficient communications and coordination on all scales (most significant challenge). ● Local government’s slow response, bureaucracy, and lack of leadership. Learned to plan for 72-hour response time for central communication to be set up. <i>”We need to manage up”.</i> <i>“In vacuum of central coordination, everyone really responded well”.</i> ● Tensions between different stakeholder groups and lack of integration, specifically between: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Institutions and grassroots ○ Government and community ○ Local and state ○ Old and new relief organizations ● Lack of volunteer coordination, especially volunteer coordination from outside area. ● Lack of adequate communication between Latino and white communities. ● Lack of clear public information on what was and was not needed, especially on social media <i>“Minimize thousands of lasagnas flying around the county”.</i> <i>“Chaos: food drops, volunteers, what was needed”.</i> |

| | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Relationships leveraged to bring resources from outside the county, into the County, including the San Francisco Bay Area (e.g., Facebook, Google, Clif Bar, Chobani), national and international organizations (e.g., Red Cross). ● Volunteerism and collaboration a major success, creating a de facto emergency food distribution workforce. ● Emergence of important attitudes and values, including passion/commitment. <i>“Passion carried us through”</i>; value for all skills and unique expertise; support of first responders; generosity and immediate flow of emergency food; grassroots culture; and community response. ● Communication via social media effective in reaching contacts early within the County and in other communities not impacted by the fire to coordinate donations and volunteers. | |
|---|--|

Planning for the Future of Emergency Food Distribution

| |
|---|
| <p>Emergency Food Distribution Infrastructure: Supply Chain</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Develop an inventory or map of existing and available resources that is maintained and updated with pre-identified appropriate resources (kitchens, trucks, refrigerators, non-profits, faith-based facilities, etc.) that could be activated in crisis or on an ongoing basis to address food security. ● Establish standards for healthy meals; ensure food safety (especially with food from out of the area traveling long distances), improve awareness of nutrition/health needs; and create a method for tracking food that is produced for emergency food response in order to pay back farmers/producers. ● Create a food donation plan that allows for smooth and thoughtful handling of immediate donations so that the system is not overwhelmed; understand what is needed to address disaster relief as well as ongoing hunger relief and how to appropriately handle and distribute fresh, prepared and non-perishable food. |
|---|

Emergency Food Distribution Human Infrastructure: Communication, Coordination, and Relationships

- Create an **information management system, information clearing house, or a central communication hub** (the top request), providing:
 - communication across county and connection between and with different parts of the county
 - leadership
 - communication between city and County EOCs
 - ability to connect directly with nonprofits
- Create a regional structure (within Sonoma County) that reinforces relationship and capacity building during non-emergencies so as to be better prepared for future emergencies
 - Identify **regional coordinators** for each area
- Develop a **structure** for emergency response with local (community-level) areas within the county, countywide, and regional.
- Grow and strengthen **countywide connections through relationships**--east to west; nonprofit to for profit; neighborhood to countywide.
- Create **resource systems and documents** for others to respond during future disasters.
- Build capacity for **local neighborhood-focused response**.
- **Bridge the gap between government response and grassroots response.**
- Develop **diverse response mechanisms** that are flexible and can operate at different scales from small shelters that pop-up to large, coordinated county-wide efforts.
- Ensure **religious congregations** have their own plans and resources.
- Plan for **technological communication breakdowns**, periods without phone/internet/cellular service.

“We needed structure for when things were happening so fast in the emergency”

Long-term Community Food Security

- Consider how emergency response can **lift up local economic support** (e.g., use gift cards to provide relief; create mechanism for reimbursements for chefs and farmers; account for reliance on small business with narrow profit margins).
- **Leverage the new or heightened awareness of food insecurity**, elevated by the disaster, to support ongoing food security in the County.
- **Ensure that Disaster SNAP** is promptly and adequately promoted.
- Help ensure the Redwood Empire Food Bank can **provide regular, continued delivery of groceries to their ongoing/standing clientele** with the goal of no break in service.

“Why can’t we do this [provide food to everyone] all the time?”

“How do we create ongoing systems to feed people in our communities?”

Discussion

Individual experiences working in emergency food distribution during the fires varied significantly affected by a number of factors. One notable and complex factor was type of organization, specifically, centralized versus decentralized, or grass roots. Discussions at the convening highlighted how the diversity in size and scale could at times result in positive, comprehensive responses but at other times in unhelpful tensions, duplication of efforts, and gaps in services.

Below is a synopsis of the nuanced and complex conversations that occurred at the gathering and awaits further exploration.

Positives:

“Grass roots efforts are nimble and responsive to their communities”, said one participant. Sometimes they offer multiple services to a subset of a community, other times they offer fewer services but in a personalized manner. This allows them to know their constituency well and can help in projecting needs and behaviors in new or uncertain situations as well as identifying unintended consequences of untested programs. *“Organizing on a micro level helps to extrapolate to the macro level organization”*, observed another participant. A question posed for further contemplation, *“How do we get larger scale organizations and governmental agencies to recognize grass roots’ strengths and incorporate that into planning and communication?”*

Some larger organizations and businesses were able to expand their services, sometimes overnight, because they already had the infrastructure in place. The outpouring of resources, people-power and food allowed them to scale existing services efficiently and effectively, even before federal or state agencies had been activated to respond.

Tensions:

There were instances when groups were duplicating efforts, were not coordinated, and gaps in services appeared, and inefficiencies arose. A thoughtful question posed by one participant was, *“How do we navigate the fact that grass roots move quickly and they don’t want (or won’t) deal with the red tape and bureaucracy with the fact that some degree of centralization locally would have been more efficient?”* Another person pondered, *“The gap between government and grass roots ideas of response is large and inefficient. The government and agencies need to include grass roots and nonprofits and first responders in policy making - they are always the first ones at the scene.”*

The lack of a standardized communication platform that came up regularly--both as a problem and potential solution. It created discord and lack of timely integration, particularly for efforts that were newly formed, new to the area, or quickly expanded. *“Efforts are still*

compartmentalized and there is a lack of responsibility/accountability around centralized communication.” Another person shared, *“We need to ‘manage up’. Local government needs to hear from our (food) organizations and understand what our County needs.”*

Planning for the Future:

Attendees of the convening had varying amounts of time to reflect on what had happened during and soon after the fires. For some, this was the first time they had come together to reflect. Thus, follow-up surveys for those that attended, and others involved in emergency food services, will provide a more comprehensive list of what is needed for future crisis events. What follows is feedback from some participants that should be considered a starting point for future inquiry.

Some participants said they wanted a clear inventory of resources that were needed and available and those that were needed and not available. Consideration should be given on how to maintain those resources, contacts, and networks long term. One participant wanted a snapshot of how things were different than expected and how individuals, collaborations, organizations, and governments behaved differently than expected during disasters. For instance, one participant learned that having access to a local commercial kitchen with cold storage was useless without electricity and no generator on-hand.

Working groups requested a platform for procedures, communication norms, and the inventory of resources, highlighting interdependencies and reinforcing relationship-building to bridge scale, role, and regional tensions. This includes setting up scenarios of how collaborations will work in emergencies. Multiple participants relayed their interest in ongoing regionalized communication or convenings between food providers who address both emergency and chronic food insecurity. *“There is a need for regional emergency committees who are volunteers from city, private, and nonprofits.”* Another person added, *“Start creating the sub-region leaders now for ongoing conversations and policy making.”*

Another area worth exploring is developing emergency preparedness that reinforces local and ongoing resilience as well as community food security and farmer recovery. As one participant stated, *“Local resilience depends on funds and fundraising.”* We need a shared structure moving forward that allows our community to take advantage of FEMA and other emergency funding programs so that local farmers, food producers, restaurants, and community organizations may be reimbursed as much as possible for their costs. This includes documentation and reimbursement of donations and volunteer hours (which was accessible to some organizations but not all).

Recommendation on Next Steps

- Survey participants represented at the event and other stakeholders not represented to get more information and seek greater clarity on their needs (e.g., “*What did you need during the disaster [information, resources, contacts, knowledge] that you didn’t have?*”)
- Identify a county-wide coordinator for emergency food response.
 - Connect food security representatives with the Care and Shelter Coordinator for the Sonoma County Emergency Operations Center, and include emergency food response in the shelter drill on Sept. 6, 2018.
- Develop an emergency food response needs assessment with a strategic plan that:
 - Identifies and expands capacity of existing governmental, nonprofit, and faith-based organizations to respond in times of disaster.
 - Builds on existing community and neighborhood food security networks and relationships.
 - Leverages the strengths of our local farm and food-based businesses.
 - Bridges the noted gap between larger centralized operations and smaller scale, grassroots, or new/spontaneously organized grassroots emergency food efforts.
 - Creates an emergency communication plan/platform that is endorsed and sustained by the County Office of Emergency.
 - Provides a directory or inventory of existing emergency food response resources.
 - Prevents more people from slipping into long-term food insecurity.
 - Identifies methods to strengthen the overall resiliency of our local food system.

Appendix 1: Attendees at the Emergency Food Response Gathering

| | First Name | Last Name | Organization | What best describes role during the emergency? |
|----|-------------------|------------------|--|---|
| 1 | Layla | Aguilar | Bi Rite Market | Farm |
| 2 | Josephine | Borgeson | Episcopal Church | Other |
| 3 | Kathy | Carver | ExtraFood.org | Food Distribution, Non-profit agency |
| 4 | Cathryn | Couch | Ceres Community Project | Meal Provider |
| 5 | Naomi | Crawford | Pizza Politana | Food Provider |
| 6 | Mimi | Enright | UC Cooperative Extension Sonoma County | facilitator |
| 7 | Marianna | Gardenhire | Backyard Restaurant | Other |
| 8 | David | Goodman | Redwood Empire Food Bank | Coordinator,Food Provider,Food Distribution,Non profit agency |
| 9 | Alison | Goodwin | Redwood Empire Food Bank | Food Provider |
| 10 | Suzi | Grady | Petaluma Bounty | Coordinator,Food Provider,Farm,Non profit agency |
| 11 | Steven | Guilliams | No Pay Cafe/Facebook prepared food donations | Coordinator, Food Distribution |
| 12 | Caiti | Hachmyer | Red H Farm | Farm |

| | | | | |
|----|---------|-----------|---|---|
| 13 | Heidi | Hansen | Sonoma Family Meal | Meal Provider |
| 14 | Lynda | Hopkins | County of Sonoma | Government Agency |
| 15 | Heather | Irwin | Sonoma Family Meal | Meal Provider |
| 16 | Daniel | Kedan | Backyard | Chef |
| 17 | Coby | Leibman | Food For Thought | Meal provider |
| 18 | Melita | Love | Farm to Pantry | Food Provider |
| 19 | Landon | McPherson | Sonoma Family Meal | Meal Provider |
| 20 | June | Michaels | Sonoma Food Runners | Non profit agency |
| 21 | Debra | Nelson | City of Healdsburg | Government Agency |
| 22 | Chelsea | Pearson | Interfaith Sustainable Food Collaborative | Non profit agency |
| 23 | Kiergan | Pegg | Sonoma County Human Services Department | Coordinator, Government Agency, Shelter organizer |
| 24 | Cynthia | Rich | GPH Church | Food Provider, Food Distribution, Non profit agency |
| 25 | DeAnna | Rogers | Santa Rosa Junior College | Coordinator, Food Distribution, Government Agency |
| 26 | Nancy | Sands | City of Petaluma | Government Agency |
| 27 | Steve | Schwartz | Interfaith Sustainable Food Collaborative | Non profit agency |
| 28 | LaSette | Sewell | Interfaith Sustainable Food Collaborative | Non profit agency |
| 29 | Juan | Torres | Catholic Charities Of Santa Rosa | Non profit agency |

| | | | | |
|----|---------|-------------------|--|-------------------|
| 30 | Julia | Van Soelen Kim | UC Cooperative Extension Sonoma County | Facilitator |
| 31 | Bill | Walton | County of Sonoma Sheriff's Office | Government Agency |
| 32 | Evan | Wiig | CAFF | Coordinator |
| 33 | Melanie | Wong | No Pay Cafe/Cafe Gratis | Coordinator |

Appendix 2: Agenda

Gathering of Emergency Food Response Network
Thursday, February 8, 2018
9:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.
North Coast Builders Exchange,
1030 Apollo Way, Santa Rosa

Goal: Build the resilience of our local food system and lift up the common goal of increasing access to good food.

Objectives:

- **Document**
 - What went well? What didn't go well?
 - What were new relationships that were made?
- **Reflect (Evaluate)**
 - What were the tensions experienced?
 - What was missing?
- **Plan**
 - What is needed to prepare for the future?
 - How do we better align efforts going forward?

Format: Through large and small group discussion, document, understand, and reflect on emergency response as a whole and by various subsets; share expertise across people, place, space, and scale.

| | |
|------------------|---|
| 9:00 a.m. | Welcome Welcoming Address, Supervisor Lynda Hopkins |
| 9:30 a.m. | Group Activity - Who is in the room? Consider 3 continua to help participants locate themselves in the matrix that is emergency food. Dig into each a bit further to help them consider where they fit it: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Years of experience, deeply rooted in food access/emergency food OR new to the work2. Centralized organizations OR decentralized, grassroots3. Focus on chronic food insecurity OR focus on disaster response |
| 9:40 a.m. | Individual Activity |

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| | <p>On index card, write clearly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● In a word or brief phrase, what was your role in the emergency food response during the fires? ● What did you draw on in that role? (e.g. skills, knowledge, experience, relationships, resources?) |
| 9:50 a.m. | <p>Table Group Discussions</p> <p>Instructions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -3 rounds, 3 groups: 1. Roles, 2. Scale, and 3. Geography. -Choose the group that fits you best. -Group facilitators will lead breakout groups through discussing a set of guiding questions for each round -Volunteer scribes will take notes on flip charts and report back on a few key points when we return to the large group. -Spend last few minutes of session identifying top factors for each question and circle on flip chart. <p>Prompts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What went well? 2. What were new relationships that were made? 3. What were the tensions? 4. What is needed for the future? 5. What are the top factor(s) for each question? Circle on flip chart. |
| 10:00 a.m. | <p>Round 1 - Roles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 farmers 2 distributors 3 chefs & cooks 4 volunteer organizers 5 communicators/networkers |
| 10:30 a.m. | <p>Round 2 - Scale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 countywide or larger 2 subregion 3 community/neighborhood |
| 11:00 a.m. | <p>Round 3 - Geography:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Central - Santa Rosa |

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| | <p>2 East – Sonoma 3 West - West County 4 North - Windsor north 5 South - Petaluma</p> |
| 11:30 a.m. | <p>Return to Large Group Reflect on top factors for each question. Reflect back on introductory framing; given that, how do we better align efforts going forward?</p> |
| 11:55 a.m. | <p>Closing & Review of Next Steps Ideas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● For ourselves = Short summary report that captures the learnings and new questions, needs, opportunities. ● For the Board of Supervisors = Summary statement for the Fire Recovery Plan Board Workshop on Safety Net and Infrastructure (Feb. 27) ● For the Sonoma County Food System Alliance = Propose updates to the Food Action Plan. |
| 12:00 a.m. | Adjourn |

Appendix 3: Data from the Emergency Food Response Gathering

Note: The detailed data can be made available upon request to Mimi Enright at mimi.enright@sonoma-county.org, or it can be accessed at <https://tinyurl.com/yboqdbka>

Qualitative data was coded thematically using an open-coding process with attention to new and emergent themes. Codes included:

- **Successes** - what went well; successes; accomplishments
- **Challenges** - What did not work well; tensions; missed opportunities; breakdowns; failures
- **Relationships** - new and existing relationships leveraged; missing relationships
- **Planning for the Future** - What is needed for the future; recommendations and good ideas for the future
- **Scale/Organization type** - Centralized organizations OR decentralized, grassroots
- **Experience** - deeply rooted in food access/emergency food OR new to the work
- **Supply chain functioning** - networks/nodes, supply chain coordination, supply chain roles
- **Communications** - social media, county-based, interpersonal communications, intra-agency
- **Capacity building**
- **Community empowerment** - Community empowerment, activation of concern around food systems and food insecurity, demonstration of sharing ethic
- **Geography**
- **Policy** - policy implications
- **Diversity** - equity, inclusion, special needs
- **Food (In)Security** - chronic/long-term food (in)security, community food security, vs. disaster response
- **Other**

Appendix 4: List of Questions for Further Thought and/or Investigation

Please note this section is a work in progress and may be found at: <https://tinyurl.com/y9ktes3c>.